Remarks

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting a telephone interview on Friday, May 28, 2004. As discussed in the interview, the Applicant is submitting a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) with this Amendment.

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Applicant has cancelled claims 2-3, and 6-22, and has added new claims 23-61. Support for amended claims 1, 4, and 5 and for new claims 23-35 may be found at, e.g., page 11, lines 10-25. Support for new claims 36-61 may be found at, e.g., pages 33-34.

The invention is directed to a system and method for dynamically generating a user interface for a computer system in, e.g., a hospital, where multiple users having different professional functions, or other distinguishing attributes, may log onto the system to retrieve information relating, for example, to their work (p. 15, lines 1-8). According to the invention, a different user interface may be generated for each individual user based on selected variables such as, e.g., the user's group identifier, the user's desired task, etc. (p. 11, lines 10-20). Values for these variables are obtained or determined based on, e.g., information provided by the user when he/she logs on (pp 11-12). Thus, if the user is a doctor, a user interface may be generated that includes buttons for "patient data" (p. 14, lines 17-25). If the user is a nurse, a user interface may be generated with a button for "patient scheduling," etc. (p. 12, lines 9-10).

The user interface is generated by a software application operating principally in the form of compiled code on a central server system (p. 13, lines 18-27). However, a collection of rules governing how various user interfaces should be created are stored separately in one or more

databases accessible to the server (p. 13, lines 18-27). The rules are stored in uncompiled form (p. 13, lines 18-27). In addition, at least some of the rules are dynamic rules, i.e., rules that contain variables for which values are supplied at run-time (p. 11, lines 20-27, p. 12, lines 5-27). Thus, at run-time, the application accesses the database(s) and selects one or more rules based on one or more criteria, such as the user's identity, the user's desired task, etc. (p. 11, lines 10-20). If the user is a doctor, for example, a set of rules pertaining to doctors may be selected (p. 11, lines 10-20). The selected rules are executed to retrieve data from a database (p. 11, lines 10-20). The data may be, for example, data needed to display a navigation button having a link to a "Cancer Task Force" page on the screen (p. 12, lines 5-8). The user interface is created using the data (p. 11, lines 3-9).

Advantageously, the use of dynamic rules (rather than pre-compiled, static rules) allows the application program to be flexible (p. 13, lines 18-20). A list of dynamic rules may be stored in un-compiled form in a database, and the system administrator can simply add more rules as desired (p. 13, lines 18-27). Thus, for example, if the hospital hires a new team of cardiac surgeons, the administrator can simply add a few new rules for cardiac surgeons (p. 13, lines 18-27). The server source code does not need to be rewritten and re-compiled each time new rules are added; in contrast, this would be necessary if static rules were used (p. 13, lines 18-27).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-3, 6, 9-13, 15, 17-20 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moshfegi (U.S. Patent No. 6,076,166). Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, and 5, and cancelled claims 2-3, 6, 9-13, 15, 17-20 and 22, and respectfully traverses the rejection.

Moshfegi discloses a system for generating web pages based on certain characteristics of the user (job, access privileges, etc.) (col. 1, lines 26-41). Specifically, web pages are generated using server scripts (i.e., short programs), which first check user information, and then create rules for generating web pages and rules for retrieving database information such as patient records (col. 2, lines 34-42). Finally, the rules are executed to generate a web page and retrieve information from a database (col. 2, lines 34-42).

However, nowhere does Moshfegi disclose or suggest selecting and retrieving a dynamic rule from a database, as required by amended claim 1. Neither does Moshfegi disclose a rule comprising a variable parameter, also recited in amended claim 1. In fact, Moshfegi suggests, if anything, that the "rules" disclosed therein are static rules created by scripts. According to Moshfegi:

> server scripts check user access privileges, user preferences, usage log, and environment profile... The outcome is rules for retrieving computer based patient records (CPR) information and rules for generation of web pages. (col. 2, lines 43-50).

Thus, as disclosed by Moshfegi, information such as user access privileges, user preferences, etc. may be used as input values for the scripts, but not as input values for the *rules*. The scripts may create the rules based on such information, but the rules themselves, once created, are not dynamic (and thus do not contain variable parameters).

A fortiori, Moshfegi also fails to disclose either determining a value of a variable parameter, or executing a dynamic rule based on such a value, both of which are required by amended claim 1. As such, amended claim 1, together with its dependent claims (4, 5, and 23-31) is patentable over Moshfegi.

New claim 32 and amended claim 1 share similar claim elements. Specifically, new claim 32 recites a plurality of rules including "at least one dynamic rule comprising one or more variable parameters." Thus, for reasons presented above for amended claim 1, new claim 32, together with its independent claims (33-35), are patentable over Moshfegi.

New claim 36 recites features not disclosed or suggested in Moshfegi. For example, Moshfegi does not disclose or suggest "rules for generating a data structure in a database," or executing a rule "to create the data structure," as required by claim 36. Thus, new claim 36, together with its dependent claims (37-40) is also patentable over Moshfegi.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 14, 16 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Moshfegi in view of Yu (U.S. Patent No. 5,410,693). Applicant has amended claims 4 and 5, and has cancelled claims 7, 8, 14, 16 and 21, and respectfully traverses the rejection.

Yu discloses a method for creating query packages containing multiple SQL statements for use in managing data stored in a database (col. 1, lines 54- 68). A database administrator selects and adds procedures to a query package (col. 5, lines 3-8). Each procedure is a single

SQL statement that has been pre-compiled, referred to as a "static" statement. (col. 3, lines 32-35).

However, nowhere does Yu, individually or in combination with Moshfegi, disclose or suggest selecting and retrieving a dynamic rule from a database, as required by amended claim 1. Neither Yu nor Moshfegi discloses or suggests a rule comprising a variable parameter, as recited in amended claim 1. In fact, Yu teaches away from amended claim 1, specifically stating that each procedure is a "static" statement.

A fortiori, Yu, individually and in combination with Moshfegi, also fails to disclose or suggest "determining a value of the variable parameter," and "executing" a dynamic rule based on such a value, which are both required by amended claim 1. As such, amended claim 1 together with its dependent claims (4, 5, and 23-31) are patentable over the cited art.

New claim 32 and amended claim 1 share similar claim limitations. Specifically, new claim 32 recites a plurality of rules including "at least one dynamic rule comprising one or more variable parameters." Thus, for reasons presented above for amended claim 1, new claim 32, together with its independent claims (33-35), are patentable over the cited art.

New claim 36 recites features not disclosed or suggested by Yu individually or in combination with Moshfegi. For example, neither Yu nor Moshfegi discloses "rules for generating a data structure in a database"; nor do they disclose or suggest executing a rule "to create the data structure," as required by claim 36. Thus, new claim 36 together with its dependent claims (37-40) are also patentable over the cited art.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, each of claims 1, 4-5, and 23-61, as amended, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, consideration or reconsideration, as appropriate, of these claims is requested and allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully,

By _____
Jonathan A. Tyler
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 52,308
212-836-7071

Date: June 7, 2004